IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 05.11.2007

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.D.DINAKARAN
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.REGUPATHI

Habeas Corpus Petition No.1071 of 2007

Veera Prakash .. Petitioner

Vs

1. The Secretary to Government.,
   Home, Prohibition and Excise Dept.,
   Fort St. George, Chennai.

2. The District Collector
   and District Magistrate,
   Villupuram District, Villupuram. .. Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issue of Writ of Habeas Corpus as stated therein.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Gandhikumar
For Respondents: Mr.N.R.Elango
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by P.D.DINAKARAN,J.)

The petitioner, son of the detenue by name Thangam, W/o.Sakthivel, who was incarcerated at Special Prison for Women, Vellore, by an order dated 6.7.2007 of the second respondent under the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 (Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982) branding her as a Bootlegger, seeks a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records in connection with the order of detention dated 6.7.2007 passed in C2/28739/2007, to set aside the same and to direct the respondents to produce the detenue before this Court and set her at liberty.

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

2. On 9.6.2007, while conducting prohibition raid by the police attached to Villupuram Prohibition Enforcement Wing, the detenue was found selling illicit arrack containing atropine of 3.18 mg. W/V as per chemical analysis report. A case was registered in Crime No.827/2007 on the file of Villupuram Prohibition Enforcement Wing for offences punishable under Section 4(1)(i), 4(1)(aaa) and 4(1-A) of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition Act. The detenue was arrested and produced before the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Villupuram, for judicial remand.

3. The second respondent, taking note of the above case as a ground case and finding that there are six adverse cases of alike nature on the file of same police station in Crime Nos.217/2006, 548/2006, 873/2006, 1011/2006, 1106/2006 and 646/2007, ordered her detention dubbing her as a bootlegger.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner challenges the impugned order of detention only on the ground of delay on the part of the sponsoring authority in sending the parawar remarks to the detaining authority.

5.1. Before delving into the issue relating to the delay as contended above, it would be apt to refer the law on the point.

5.2. Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India suggests that the obligation of the government is to offer the detenu an opportunity of making a representation against the order, before it is confirmed according to the procedure laid down under the relevant provisions of law, vide K.M. Abdulla Kunhi v. Union of India, (1991) 1 SCC 476 .

5.3. The right to representation under Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India includes right to expeditious disposal by the State Government. Expedition is the rule and delay defeats mandate of Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India, vide Ram Sukrya Mhatre v. R.D. Tyagi, 1992 Supp (3) SCC 65.

5.4. Any inordinate and unexplained delay on the part of the Government in considering the representation renders the detention illegal, vide Tara Chand v. State of Rajasthan, (1980) 2 SCC 321 and Raghavendra Singh v. Supdt., Distt. Jail, (1986) 1 SCC 650.

5.5. It is a constitutional obligation of the Government to consider the representation forwarded by the detenu without any delay. Though no period is prescribed by Article 22 of the Constitution for the decision to be taken on the representation, the words “as soon as may be” in clause (5) of Article 22 convey

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

the message that the representation should be considered and disposed of at the earliest. But that does not mean that the authority is pre-empted from explaining any delay which would have occasioned in the disposal of the representation. The court can certainly consider whether the delay was occasioned due to permissible reasons or unavoidable causes. If delay was caused on account of any indifference or lapse in considering the representation, such delay will adversely affect further detention of the prisoner. In other words, it is for the authority concerned to explain the delay, if any, in disposing of the representation. It is not enough to say that the delay was very short. Even longer delay can as well be explained. So the test is not the duration or range of delay, but how it is explained by the authority concerned. Even the reason that the Minister was on tour and hence there was a delay of five days in disposing of the representation was rejected by the Apex Court holding that when the liberty of a citizen guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India is involved, the absence of the Minister at head quarters is not sufficient to justify the delay, since the file could be reached the Minister with utmost promptitude in cases involving the vitally important fundamental right of a citizen, vide Rajammal v. State of T.N., (1999) 1 SCC 417.

6. Coming to the case on hand, admittedly, objecting to the order of detention dated 6.7.2007, a representation was made on behalf of the detenue dated Nil, which was received by the Government on 25.7.2007. Remarks were called for from the detaining authority on 26.7.2007, who, in turn, called for parawar remarks from the sponsoring authority on 3.8.2007. But the sponsoring authority took his own time and sent the parawar remarks only on 11.8.2007, i.e. after a delay of eight days. Even taking note of the intervening holidays, viz. 4.8.2007 and 5.8.2007 (being Saturday and Sunday), there is delay of six days in sending the parawar remarks, which is unexplained and inexcusable. Thereafter, the detaining authority sent the remarks on the same day, i.e. on 11.8.2007 and it was received by the Government on 17.8.2007. The file was submitted on 20.8.2007 and the Under Secretary and the Additional Secretary considered the file on 21.8.2007 and on 22.8.2007 the Minister concerned considered and rejected the same. The rejection letter was prepared on 24.8.2007, it was sent to the detenu on 28.8.2007 and served on the detenue on 30.8.2007.

7. At this juncture, a reference to the decision of the Apex Court in Kundanbhai Dulabhai Sheikh v District Magistrate, Ahmedabad, (1996) 3 SCC 194 is apposite:

> "In spite of law laid down above by this Court repeatedly over the past three decades, the Executive, namely, the State Government and its officers continue to behave in their old, lethargic fashion and like all other files

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

rusting in the Secretariat for various reasons including red-tapism, the representation made by a person deprived of his liberty, continue to be dealt with in the same fashion. The Government and its officers will not give up their habit of maintaining a consistent attitude of lethargy. So also, this Court will not hesitate in quashing the order of detention to restore the 'liberty and freedom' to the person whose detention is allowed to become bad by the Government itself on account of his representation not being disposed of at the earliest."

8. That apart, it is a settled law that there should not be supine indifference, slackness or callous attitude in considering the representation. Any unexplained delay in the disposal of representation would be a breach of the constitutional imperative and it would render the continued detention impermissible and illegal, vide K.M. Abdulla Kunhi v. Union of India, (1991) 1 SCC 476.

9. In the instant case, there is delay of six days on the part of the sponsoring authority in sending the parawar remarks to the detaining authority, as referred to above, and the same, in our considered opinion, vitiates the impugned order of detention. We are, therefore, inclined to allow this petition.

In the result, the order of detention is set aside. The detenue is directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless her presence is required in connection with any other case.

sra

sd/-
Asst.Registrar

/true copy/

Sub Asst.Registrar

To:

1. The Secretary to Government
of Tamil Nadu, Home, Prohibition and
Excise Department, Fort St. George,
Chennai 600 009.

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

2. The District Magistrate
   and District Collector
   Villupuram District, Villupuram.

3. The Superintendent, Central
   Special Prison for Women, Vellore.

4. The Joint Secretary to Government,
   Public (Law and Order) Department,
   Fort St George, Chennai 9.

5. The Public Prosecutor,
   High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.1071 of 2007

RS(CO)
SR/20.11.2007

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/